

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings are formal replacements for all of the drawings previously submitted.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1/1

## REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the drawings. Accordingly applicants are providing formal drawings replacing all previous drawings as requested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over White (US 20020127986), citing only a single reference.

White does not disclose a system for simultaneous ACLR measurement. A measurement system is concerned with accurately measuring a phenomenon. Instead, White provides an apparatus for “locating and **suppressing**” distortion in an amplifier system, rather than measuring it. (White at [0017]). While, [0050] makes mention of ACLR, there is no teaching in White to measure ACLR, rather “Specifications such as... Adjacent Channel Leakage Ratio (ACLR) may govern the selection of the threshold.” In order to meet these specification, the feed forward correction is optimized until the IMD products fall below a predetermined threshold.

Applicant is unable to determine from the rejection, where White provides for a wideband channel and a narrowband channel, must less a narrowband channel providing a low speed, high resolution data stream as an output.

The Examiner further states, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the paths may be of different types to promote divers **signaling** in the system for interoperability over more systems. This signaling as taught be White would be appropriate to multi-carrier power amplifiers. It remains unclear how it would teach one of ordinary skill to produce a system for measurements as provided my claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is nonobvious over White. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 1.

Claims 2-5 depend directly, or indirectly, from independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the reasons provided above. In addition, in reviewing [0036] through [0038] of White, Applicant is unable to identify both a wideband channel and a narrowband channel. [0038] teaches away from two channels in that rather than having two channels, the “two considerations, speed and accuracy, must be balanced in selecting the pass bandwidth.” This need for balancing is due in part to

not having both a wideband channel optimized for one task, and a narrow band channel optimized for a different task. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of dependent claims 2-5.

In view of the foregoing remarks allowance of claims 1 – 5 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are respectfully requested.

Applicant submits herewith an Information Disclosure Statement, and wishes to point out that the listing of cases includes co-pending published application 20050207512, which has an available file history on public PAIR should the Examiner wish to consider it.

Respectfully submitted,

Linley F. Gumm

By /Matthew D. Rabdau/  
Matthew D. Rabdau  
Reg. No. 43,026  
Attorney for Applicants

TEKTRONIX, INC.  
P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW)  
Beaverton, OR 97077  
(503) 627-7261

7724 US